Case 5:11-cv-01339-LHK Document 73 Filed 09/10/13 Page 2 of 2

| 1 | than the rule. Appointment is mandatory only when the circumstances of a particular case |
|----|---|
| 2 | indicate that appointed counsel is necessary to prevent due process violations. See Chaney v. |
| 3 | Lewis, 801 F.2d 1191, 1196 (9th Cir. 1986). At this time, appointment of counsel is not |
| 4 | mandated, and the interests of justice do not require appointment of counsel. Accordingly, |
| 5 | petitioner's request is DENIED . This denial is without prejudice to the court's <i>sua sponte</i> |
| 6 | reconsideration should the developments of this case dictate otherwise. |
| 7 | This order terminates docket numbers 69, 70 and 72. |
| 8 | IT IS SO ORDERED. |
| 9 | DATED: 9/10/13 Fucy H. Koh |
| 10 | United States District Judge |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |

28